

**IN THE  
MATTER**

of the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE  
MATTER**

of applications for resource consents to  
take and use water in the Waitaki River  
Catchments

---

Memorandum from the reporting officers for Environment Canterbury

20 April 2010

---

1. The purpose of this memorandum is to respond to a request from the commissioners for feedback on whether three new reports and a memorandum should be accepted and if so, on what basis.
2. The following reports have been received by applicant representatives in the last few days:
  - Groundwater Investigation Pukaki Flats Mackenzie District, Summary Prepared for Simons Hill Station Limited and Simons Pass Station Limited Report, Aqualinc, April 2010
  - Statement of evidence of David Anthony Horn, GHD, 21 April 2010
  - Statement of evidence of Jose Roberto Romero, GHD, undated.
3. In addition, a memorandum was received from Meridian's legal representative in early March with a letter/report from Donna Sutherland, NIWA, titled "Status of Didymo in the Upper Waitaki Hydro-Power Canals".
4. Each of the above reports/memorandum contain new information that to a greater or lesser degree may assist in assessing the actual or potential effects of specific resource consent applications. We have not had sufficient time to examine the reports in detail. However, we are satisfied that the information, provided that it is able to be considered in the context of reviews by appropriately qualified experts, may provide useful information.
5. We recognise that the introduction of new information at this stage of the process and the allowance of a review process would cause a delay and potentially result in parties incurring expense in undertaking reviews. However, on balance we consider that the additional information that may potentially be made available warrants a short delay to the proceedings.
6. We consider that it would be appropriate to provide a short period of say two to three weeks to enable all parties (submitters and reporting officers in terms of the applicant evidence, and the applicant, other submitters and reporting officers in terms of the Meridian memorandum) an opportunity to undertake a brief review would be appropriate. To reinforce the need for any reviews to be brief we suggest that a limit of five pages be set for any parties' review of any report.
7. An additional hearing session could potentially be scheduled in mid-May for reviews to be presented and for any other outstanding matters. Alternatively, if commissioners were not available to physically hear any review reports, we do not consider that a hearing is essential and those reports could just be submitted for consideration. If commissioners had questions arising from those reviews then a hearing session would need to be arranged.



Mike Freeman

**On behalf of Environment Canterbury reporting officers**

20 April 2010